

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated April 4, 2005. Claims 1, 4-11, and 17-25 are pending. Claims 1, 4-11, and 17-25 are rejected. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Claims 26-27 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-11, and 17-27 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 4-11, and 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention. The Examiner states:

As per claim 1 line 8 recites "...inputs..." It is not made clear what applicant is considering as inputs.

As per claim 1 line 8 recites "...inputs..." The plurality of "inputs" is not noticed through and seems to be missing from the claimed invention as recited in claim 1.

As per claim 1 line 10 recites "...substantially...". Use of the word "substantially" makes the claim language indefinite.

Claims 4-11 are indefinite because they depend on indefinite antecedent claims.

Claims 17-25 have similar rejections.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "data inputs from the application program from the first format in the first frame buffer" to be the element subject to the claimed transformation. (See Specification generally, and specifically at p. 6, line 6.) Further, Applicant has deleted "substantially" from claim 1. Corresponding amendments were made to claim 17. Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 17 are now definite, and the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Claims 1, 4-11, and 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1029b) as being anticipated by Bindlish et al (5,608,864), hereinafter, Bindlish. The Examiner states:

As per claims 1 and 17 Bindlish teaches providing a first format in a first frame buffer, the first format compatible with a format for an application program see for example figure 5b block 530 and claim 1 for the first FIFP and also figures 6-7; providing a second format in a second frame buffer, the second format compatible with a format for an output device see

for example figure 5b block 551 and claim 1 for the second FIFO and also figures 6-7; and transforming inputs from the application program from the first format in the first frame buffer to the second format in the second frame buffer for output on the output device to provide compatibility between the application program and the output device without substantially altering the application program see for example figure 5b for blocks 535-537 (DAC 536) and also figures 6-7...

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Bindlish discloses a computer video controller which provides two video data pipelines for simultaneously displaying full motion video within a window in a video display. A first data pipeline (CRF FIFO 530, Serializer 531, Mux 533, and DAC 536) displays background video at a first pixel depth. A second data pipeline (MVW FIFO 551, Serializer 552, Mux 537, and DAC 536) is provided to display a motion video window at a second pixel depth. Thus, two parallel data pipelines are provided. (Abstract; Col. 7, line 18 through col. 9, line 65)

However, in contrast to the present invention, the format of the data in the first data pipeline of Bindlish is not transformed into the format of the data in the second data pipeline. Instead, both formats (i.e., pixel depths) are supported in the video display in parallel data pipelines without transformation. The background video at the first pixel depth and the MVW at the second pixel depth are displayed simultaneously. No transformation from a first format to a second format occurs.

Thus, Bindlish does not teach or suggest transforming data inputs from the application program from the first format in the first frame buffer to the second format in the second frame buffer for output on the output device, in combination with the other elements, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 17.

Therefore, for the above identified reasons, the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 17 are neither taught nor suggested by Bindlish. Applicant further submits that claims 4-11 and 18-27 are also allowable because they depend on the above

allowable base claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 4-11, and 17-27 are patentable over the cited reference. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and does not appear to be any more relevant than the applied references.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

July 1, 2005
Date

Michele Liu/ Reg. No. 44,875
Michele Liu
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(650) 493-4540